

THE
DIVINITY of CHRIST
DEFENDED;

AND

His Equality with God the Father,
FULLY PROVED FROM SCRIPTURE:

BEING

An ANSWER to a PAMPHLET

WRITTEN BY

S. KINGSFORD.

INTITLED

"The SUPREMACY of GOD the FATHER,
and the INFERIORITY and SUBORDINA-
TION of JESUS CHRIST, &c."

By J. REYNOLDS, *R*
Minister of the Gospel.

To the law and to the testimony, if they speak not according
to this word, it is because there is no light in them.—
Isaiah viii. 20.

I am the Lord, and besides me there is no Saviour.—Isaiah
liii. 11.

This is Christ the Saviour of the world.—John iv. 42.

And Thomas answered and said unto him, my Lord and my
God.—John xx. 28.

That ye might be filled with all the fulness of God.—
Eph. iii. 19.

L O N D O N,

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR:

And sold by J. Parsons, No. 21, Paternoster-Row; J.
Bruce, No. 5, and J. Phillips, No. 27, City-Road; and
at the Methodist Preaching-House, &c.



E R R A T A.

Page. Line.

- 3 23 for that I recollect *r.* I do not recollect
ibid. 24 for never *r.* ever
4 25 for the *r.* they
ibid. — the note at the bottom, after Isaiah *r.*
Matt. i. 23.
7 3 after be *add* that
ibid. 19 after possession *add* of
9 17 for rested *r.* wrested
19 23 instead of the period after *Trinitarians*
place a comma
ibid. 24 after without *add* an
22 24 for proves *r.* prove
23 7 for follows *r.* follow
27 15 for he—are *r.* he are
28 3 from the bottom for page 15, *r.* 11.
30 3 after proof *add* of
ibid. 26 dele *not*
36 24 for Eph. *r.* Epistle
ibid. ult. after chap. iii. *add* chap. v.
38 7 dele *he*
ibid. 9 after *Trinitarians* *add* is
39 18 for chapter five *r.* chapter v.
40 16 after they *add* have
43 7 for him *r.* himself
ibid. 10 for chapter six *r.* chap. vi.
51 19 for 44, *r.* 37 and 38
62 6 after lived *add* a comma

The Reader is desired to correct the above Errata
with his pen, before he peruses the Pamphlet.

THE
P R E F A C E.

WHEN I came into this part of the kingdom, it was not my intention to enter into controversy; nor had I the most distant idea of it: It was my earnest desire, simply, to go forward with that blessed work, which I am fully persuaded the Lord, in the course of his providence, has appointed me, (viz.) that of preaching the Gospel. I am fully convinced that it is required in Stewards, and particularly in Stewards of the mysteries of God, that a man be found faithful, particularly in endeavouring to inform the judgment, in every essential point of doctrine. From this conviction, I am induced to send forth the {following sheets into the world, hoping they may

be of some service to those sincere Christians, of all denominations, into whose hands they may fall; nevertheless, I do not presume, that the most convincing arguments, that can be produced in favour of the Godhead of Christ, will have any weight with those who have embraced the opposite opinion; as they look upon themselves to be so well informed, and are so peculiarly attached to their favorite system, that, rather than give it up, they will give up a part of the sacred writings.* Therefore to argue with such avails but little, all we can do for them, is to pray that the Lord would bring them into the way of truth. But I would caution those who have not embraced it, to take heed how they hear, and what they read; for (as the beloved disciple informs us) "Whosoever transgresseth and abideth not in the doctrine of Christ hath not God, but he that abideth in the doctrine of Christ hath both the FATHER and the SON." The doctrine contended for in the following pages requires no human

* This Dr. Priestley has publicly acknowledged.

P R E F A C E.

art, no sophistry, no wresting of Scripture in its defence ; all that is requisite is to set forth, in a proper point of view, those passages, (and they are many) which contain it ; and to vindicate them from all the false glosses which have been put upon them, by artful and designing men ; (who, to carry their point, do not scruple to add to, or take from, the book of God :) and this I have endeavoured to do in the following strictures. I am persuaded the subject demanded a much abler pen, and when I consider how well it has been defended, by men so eminent for piety and learning ; I confess that there is a degree of absurdity, in any production of mine making its appearance. But this I can say, I have not written for the praise of men, but for the honor of God ; and if the meanest member of Christ's mystical body, can be of service to his cause, either by converting sinners from the error of their way, or building up those who have believed, on their most holy faith, I am sensible that God will approve, although men may disapprove. The doctrine of the Trinity, cannot rightly be understood
by

vi P R E F A C E.

by any, but those who are created anew in Christ Jesus, and who walk in that liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free: they are strengthened with might by the Spirit in the inner man, Christ dwells in their heart by faith and they are filled with all the fulness of God. -This experimental knowledge of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost will make us wise unto salvation; and prepare us to receive that crown of righteousness, which the LORD, the RIGHTEOUS JUDGE, shall give unto all who love his appearing. That this, Reader, may be thy happy lot and portion,

Is the sincere prayer, of

Your Servant in the Gospel,

THE AUTHOR.

AN ANSWER, &c.

MR. *Kingsford* opens his introduction with observing, that, "The doctrine of the Trinity has lately been much discussed," that "It is a subject deserving attention, and with candour and humility to enter into an investigation of it, cannot be disgraceful to a professor of Christianity." This is certainly true; and it would have been highly commendable in Mr. K. had he acted consistently with his own principles, and investigated it more minutely: it is probable he would then have read, and considered, those passages of Scripture, which prove to a demonstration, the equality of the Son with the Father: unless, like his old friend *Socinus*, he is determined not to believe it.*

He then proceeds, with observing, that the Unitarian doctrine is nearly, if not quite, essential to salvation. His words are as follow. "To me the peerless unequalled majesty of the one God and Father of Jesus Christ, appears both

* I have somewhere read, an extract from *Socinus* where he saith, "The greatest force is to be used rather than allow the satisfaction of Christ. As for my part, (saith he) though such a thing as the satisfaction of Christ should be found, not once, but frequently in the sacred Records, I would not believe it."

an evident and important doctrine in the Christian religion." But what passage of Scripture authorizes him to assert, that "There is but---ONE intelligent, individual person?" That there is but one God, we readily allow; but that there is only one person in the Godhead, requires better proof than he has given us.

He goes on expressing his astonishment "At the earnestness of Trinitarians, in contending for the Deity of Christ, as a being in full perfection equal to God his Father; and their making it an essential article of faith." Should he not rather have expressed his astonishment at St. *Paul*, who tells us, that Christ,* "being in the form of God, thought it not robbery (although Mr. K. does) to be equal with God;" and at our Lord himself, who declared unto the Jews, † "If ye believe not that I AM, ‡ ye shall die in your sins!" Had he properly considered this passage, with the preceding and subsequent contexts, he perhaps might not have been quite so much astonished at Trinitarians, laying so great a stress upon the belief of the Divinity of the Son.

He then takes upon him to point out the sources of what he conceives to be, "Trinitarian deception," and represents those who hold

* Phil. ii. 6. † John viii. 24.

§ The pronoun, *he*, is not in the original.

the doctrine of the Trinity, either as drones, who have not paid a proper attention to Scripture phrases, or as men wanting discernment who have taken passages of Scripture literally, which ought to be understood spiritually. However I have not the least doubt, but many who are of Trinitarian sentiments, are equally as diligent, perhaps as sensible, and consequently as capable of explaining obscure passages of Scripture, as Mr. K. or any other person of the same sentiments.

Page the 7th he acknowledges that "The appellation God is given to Christ;" but he soon explains himself, informing us, that "It is a relative term, and that it is applied to others and may be to him in a sense inferior to its highest acceptation." To this, I answer, that when the appellation God is given to Judges or Magistrates in Scripture, it respects their office, not their persons, and is intended to put them in mind of their indispensable duty to execute the judgments of God; and do that which is right in his sight. Farther, that I recollect that this appellation is never given, in the singular number, to any man but the Mediator; except in the case of Moses, when the Lord said unto him † "See I have made thee a god unto Pharaoh;" evidently referring to the office of Moses, respecting the deliverance of the Israelites. But

† Exodus vii. 1.

the appellation God is given to Christ in the singular number, and in its highest acceptation by the prophet; who, prophesying of him, calls him * “Wonderful, Counsellor, the mighty God, the everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.” By the mouth of the same Prophet the Lord Jehovah declares, † “Besides me there is no Saviour;” nevertheless in another place, our Redeemer declares, that he is § mighty to save, and that his || own arm brought Salvation.”

Mr. K. informs us, that “The same observation holds good respecting the term Father, which is applied both to God and to Christ, with relation to the Church.” But it appears to me, that if the term Father being applied to Christ, means any thing, it must signify that Christ, as touching his divine nature, is of the same essence with the Father, although not the same person; for if we take it in any other sense, (and particularly in Mr. K—’s) it necessarily follows, that there is a plurality of Fathers and no Son, which Idea would be much more absurd than that which Mr. K. has so justly exposed page 19th.—As to the division which the [Trinitarians] make of “The divine and human nature of Christ,” it is very evident that the Scripture makes the same. The Prophet Isaiah tells us, ** “A Virgin shall bring forth a

* Isaiah ix. 6.—† Isaiah xliii. 11.—§ Chap. lxiii. 1.

|| Chap. lxiii. 5.—** Isaiah vii. 14.

Son, and his name shall be called Immanuel, which is God with us." The same inspired writer informs us, that he should be † "A man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." Our Lord when discoursing with Nicodemus declared "† No man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man which is in heaven." From this I infer, that Christ as God, was Omnipresent, while, as man he dwelt upon earth. Now it is evident that the human nature of Christ could be in but one place at the same time, and yet he declared, even while he dwelt among men, "¶ Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." How then can Mr. K. be so positive as to assert "That this division can neither be reconciled with the character of Christ, nor the letter of Scripture;" when it is in exact conformity to both. In order that we may understand this aright, it is necessary to enquire, for what end Christ came into the world. The answer to this inquiry is plain, and easy to be understood by the most illiterate person. * "He came into the world to save sinners;" or, as he himself declares, † "to give his life a ransom for many." From hence it appears, that Christ voluntarily undertook our cause, and substituted himself in our room; and hence the inspired writers, in refer-

† Isaiah liii. 3.—† John iii. 13.—¶ Matt. viii. 20.

* 1 Tim. i. 15.—† Matt. xx. 28.

ence to his redeeming mankind, speak of his divine and human nature. St. Paul tells us, that he * "Is the Lord from heaven," nevertheless he calls him † "the last Adam, the second man." St. John, declares that § "the Word was made [or united to] flesh," even "the Word" which || "was [and is] God, and tabernacled** among men." In another place, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, and Servant of Jesus Christ, assures us, that †† "of the Jews, as concerning the flesh, Christ came," and immediately adds "who is over all God blessed for ever." Here it manifestly appears, that the Apostle puts a distinction between his divine and human nature; and this our Lord confirms, declaring §§ "I am the root and the offspring of David:" now as man he could not be the root of David, for he was not born till some hundred years after him; and as to his divine nature he could not be the offspring of David, because he was before him; ||| "Before Abraham was I AM." I shall not refer to, or quote any writer upon this subject, but shall rest it entirely upon the Word of God, being conscious, if it can be proved from that, it is sufficient, and if it cannot, all that the most wise and learned men have written upon it will be of no avail.

* 1 Cor. xv. 47. † Ver. 45. § John i. 14. || Ver. 1.

** This is nearer to the original than the common translation.

†† Rom. ix. 5. §§ Rev. xxii. 16. ||| John viii. 58.

The Scripture declares that Christ *^u was made like unto his brethren" and that it be-
 moved him so to be ; " he † was in all points
 tempted like as we are, yet without sin : " now
 from this, it appears that he was very man ;
 having a human body and a human soul. It is
 farther evident, from his own words ; " Destroy ‡
 this temple, and in three days I will raise it up,
 for he spake of the temple of his body." It is
 equally evident, that he had a human soul ;
 " Now § is my soul troubled." " My || soul is
 exceeding sorrowful ; " and the Prophet informs
 us that his soul ** (as well as his body) should
 be made "an offering for sin." I take it for
 granted, that Mr. K. is not so weak as to ima-
 gine, that his soul was in existence, in another
 world, before his body existed ; and that, when
 the fulness of time was come, the soul went and
 took possession it : this, to use his own words,
 would be " entirely fanciful ; " nevertheless he
 acknowledges, that he existed before he came
 upon earth, although he does not pretend to
 ascertain the time, when he was brought into
 existence. It is very well he has not attempted
 it, for he would only have exposed his ignorance
 in so doing ; because the Scripture, which he
 professes to ground his faith upon, would imme-
 diately contradict him ; informing him, " that ††
 he is before all things, and " that " by him all

* Heb. ii. 17. † Heb. iv. 15. ‡ John ii. 19.
 § John xii. 27. || Matt. xxvi. 38.] ** Isaiah liii. 10, 12.
 †† Col. i. 17.

things consist." If, as some wise and good men suppose, Christ is spoken of by Solomon, his eternity is clearly set forth * "I was† set up from everlasting from the beginning or ever the earth was; ‡ I was by him as one brought up with him, and I was daily his delight, rejoicing always before him."

I know, those who deny the Godhead of Christ, have an artful method of explaining this passage a different way; they represent the Wisdom spoken of, as "The quality or faculty of wisdom, by which God created the world, and disposed the matter or bodies into proper order," but admitting this to be the case, it rather makes against them than otherwise; because all things were created by Christ. The Apostle does not say, as Mr. K. would insinuate, that "Christ had a concern in the creation," no, but "by|| him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth:" Now the Wisdom spoken of, is said to be "possessed** by the Lord, in the beginning of his way, before his works of old," to be "set up from everlasting." If then Christ made all things, as the Scriptures declare; and if the Wisdom spoken of, was with him who made all things, from everlasting; it necessarily follows, that Christ, as God, existed from eternity.

* Prov. viii. 23.

† That Christ is here spoken of I have not the least doubt.

‡ Prov. viii. 30. || Col. i. 16. ** Prov. viii. 22.

eternity.* But as Man he [Christ] did not exist from everlasting, no, nor twelve months before he was born; nevertheless Mr. K. is confident that he is Man; and I think the Scriptures I have quoted, clearly prove that he is God; so that between us, we have made clear to a demonstration, what he is unwilling to believe, i. e. Christ is God and man united in one person.

Upon this foundation, I shall ground all my arguments in the following pages; and have no doubt, through the assistance of him, "In* whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge," but I shall make it appear, to the satisfaction of every candid reader, that Mr. K. is mistaken in his judgment—has quoted the Scriptures, and rested them to serve his own purposes—has kept out of sight those passages which make against him—has represented the sentiments of Trinitarians in an unfavourable light, and has palmed upon the public, a doctrine, which is injurious to the cause of God in general, and inconsistent with the plan of Salvation.

Mr. K. begins his first chapter with asserting what no Trinitarian denies, that the "Deity

* This is confirmed by the Prophet, when speaking of Christ. "Whose goings forth have been of old, FROM EVERLASTING."—Mich. v. 2.

may be known by the evidences of his being and perfections, which are engraven in shining characters in the works of creation and providence." But I would ask him, or any man of sense, 'whether he can prove from this that Jesus Christ is not God; if he cannot, what does he do but beat the air in asserting it.

I shall now proceed to the passages of Scripture he has quoted. The first is Matt. xix. 17. "Why callest thou me good, there is none good but one, that is God." What he has asserted, from this passage, is chiefly supposition, and consequently does not prove his point. Besides, his explication appears to me quite absurd; according to it, he supposes the young man, who came to Christ, had an idea that he was good in the highest acceptation of the word, and that our Lord reprov'd him for such a supposition, by informing him, that he was not the person he took him to be. If so, would not our Lord rather have address'd him in the following manner; "Thou callest me good it is true, but be it known unto thee, that there is but one person who is good, in the sense thou meanest, and I am not that person, I am only a mere creature; that one is God the Father." How would Mr. K. have triumphed in reading such a passage? But it appears to me, that the young man was of a different way of thinking, and, that his conceptions of Christ were too mean; therefore
he

he addressed him in the following manner ; why callest thou me good, there is none good but one, that is God ; in order that he might inform his judgment aright, in a matter of so great importance ; which he undoubtedly would have done, had he complied with the command given him in the 21st verse, for let it be observed, he does not say, either there, or any where else, I am not God.

The second is John xvii. 3. "That they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent." It appears to me that Mr. K. as well as the rest of the Unitarians, is mistaken in his interpretation of this passage. For it should be observed, that our Lord calls the Father ; "the only true God," in opposition to the heathen deities, which may be justly deemed false gods. He declares, at the same time, that the knowledge of himself, is equally essential to eternal life with the knowledge of the Father. But according to Mr. K's explication, the Scripture contradicts itself ; he says "This precludes all others from having this epithet applied to them, &c." Now either he, or St. John are mistaken, for the latter declares * "This is the true God ;" but Mr. K. affirms that he is not the true God, as that appellation belongs to none but the Father. But if he is determined

* 1. John v. 20.

to be wise above what is written, he must excuse us if we differ from him.

However when he quotes the third passage, he takes it for granted that he shall carry his point, and supposes it is not possible for any one to answer what he has so dogmatically asserted. The text is, * "To God only wise through Jesus Christ." However when he comes to the explication, he transposes the words, and writes, "Only wise God." He observes that the words are to be understood "Of the absolute supremacy of God the Father, because glory is ascribed to him through Jesus Christ;" but let it be remarked, that the Scripture, elsewhere, ascribes to Christ, the same wisdom and glory which are here ascribed to the Father through him. The words of St. Jude are a sufficient answer to all Mr. K. has advanced: † "To the only wise God our Saviour, be glory, and majesty, dominion and power both now and for ever:" nevertheless he [Mr. K.] hath the assurance to assert, that, "these epithets" cannot "possibly be applied to the Son of God, in any view whatever."

The fourth text he produces to prove his point, is, 1 Tim. vi. 16. "Who only hath immortality, &c." Would any man who has read, and studied the Scriptures, have brought this

* Rom. xvi. 27. † Jude - 25.

passage to prove the inferiority of Christ to the Father? when, according to the whole scope and tenor of it, it evidently refers to Christ, as the judge of quick and dead. I shall transcribe the whole passage, and make a remark or two upon it. * " I give thee charge in the sight of God, who quickeneth all things, and before Jesus Christ, who before Pontius Pilate witnessed a good confession; That thou keep this commandment without spot, unrebukeable, until the appearing of our Lord Jesus Christ: Which in his times he shall shew, who is the blessed and only potentate, the King of Kings, and Lord of Lords; who only hath immortality dwelling in the light, &c." Now it evidently appears, that, the Apostle in verse the 16th, alludes to the King of Kings, &c. spoken of verse 15, and it is equally evident, that, he *there* alludes to the Lord Jesus Christ, spoken of verse 14, besides, the titles King of Kings, &c. are † elsewhere applied to the Son. Let Mr. K. then for ever be silent about Trinitarians. "Taking Scripture phrases according to the mere sound of them, without attention to the connection, and other passages of Scripture," for it evidently appears, that, he has here been guilty of the same error. As to his other quotation, ‡ it appears clear to me that our Lord there refers to his office as Mediator.

* 1 Tim. vi. 13. 14, 15, 16. † Rev. xix. 16.

‡ John v. 26.

But in his fifth quotation,§ he takes it for granted, that he has found a passage of Scripture, which fully answers his purpose; and hence he exultingly exclaims, "How striking is the climax in this text." But it should be observed, that this climax is one of Mr. K's, own making, not St. Paul's, for the words of the text are as follow, "The head of every man is Christ, the head of the woman is the man, and the head of Christ is God." Now in the first page Mr. K. has fairly quoted the words; but when he comes to the explication, he transposes them in order to make a climax; for this appears to be all the advantage he has gained by it; and he only observes from it, that, it is "decidedly in favor of the supremacy of God the Father;" whereas the word Father does not occur once in the whole chapter, nor in but two of the other passages which he has quoted.

I would here observe, that one || passage refers to the work of redemption, as carried on by the ever blessed Trinity; and the other * to the manner in which we should address the Deity when we pray: In either point of view, Christ is held forth unto us, as the one Mediator between God and man, but this does not prove, that he is not equal with the Father, as touching his divine nature.

§ 1 Cor. xi. 3. || 1 Cor. iii. 23. * 1 Cor. xi. 3.

The sixth text is, 1 Cor. i. 30, "Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, &c." Now I would ask any reasonable man what advantage Mr. K. has gained by quoting this text; what does it prove? why no more for his system than against it, if so much: had it been worded in the following manner, "Christ Jesus, who in his highest capacity is inferior to the Father, is nevertheless of him, made unto us wisdom, &c." he might have quoted it with more propriety; but how would that accord with what immediately follows? "He * that glorieth let him glory in the Lord;" which appellation belongs to the Son as well as the Father.

In his seventh quotation he seems to have gained no more advantage than in the former; as his comment upon it is equally inconclusive. † "Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ." He remarks; "Here are two relations as expressive as well can be, God is the God of Jesus;" he nevertheless acknowledges that "the term God may be given to Jesus, as well as to others inferior to him." But let him, or any other Unitarian, produce a passage of Scripture where the appellation God, is given to others, who are inferior, in the same sense as it is given to Christ. Where is any one besides him called the § Mighty God—‡ God with

* 1 Cor. i. 31. † Eph. i. 3. § Isaiah ix. 6.

‡ Matt. i. 23.

us—or * God blessed for ever? Nevertheless we thank Mr. K. for the concession, but I believe if he had been aware of the advantage it has given us against him, he would not have made it. We grant that Christ is no where "said to be the God of his Father, nor do I know that any one, who has written in defence of his Godhead, ever asserted or supposed it: It is quite sufficient if we can prove what we undertake, and here the Scripture is decidedly in our favor. † "Awake O sword against my Shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts." This clearly proves that Christ, as God, is equal with the Father. As to the distinction which is put between God the Father and God the Son in the first of Heb. it evidently refers to the Son in his Mediatorial capacity, for in that, and that alone, he is the anointed of the Father.

The next, and last passage which Mr. K. has produced, in favour of his hypotheses, in this chapter, is Phil. ii. 11. "Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father." In order to understand this passage aright, it is necessary to begin at verse 6, and read to the 12th, and then, I am persuaded we shall behold three distinct characters of our Lord, represented in a striking and beautiful manner; (1.) What he was before he came into the world; "Who being in the

* Rom. ix. 5.

† Zech. xiii. 7.

form* of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God." (2.) What he condescended to become, do, and suffer for our sakes; "But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross;" (3.) The reward he has received in consequence of his obedience, sufferings, and death; "Wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, That at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth; and things under the earth; and that every Tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father." Here it should be observed, that it is enjoined for every tongue to confess him, and for every rational creature to pay him supreme worship: Nor does it at all diminish from the glory of the Father when we worship Christ; for we are commanded to "honour the Son, even as we honour the Father." I hope Mr. K. will not quarrel with us for exalting Christ as high as the Scripture exalts him, this is all we desire; and I am persuaded, we shall be

* What a striking proof is this of Christ having two distinct natures. "In the FORM of God—EQUAL with God—took upon him the FORM of a servant—Was made in the LIKENESS of men."

† 1 John v. 23.

belongs only to God his Father," for he declares, "All * things that the Father hath are mine; I † and my Father are one."

It is worthy of observation, that when the Jews charged him [Christ] with blasphemy for this assertion, and took up stones to stone him, he did not recant.

From hence I conclude, that Mr. K. is mistaken in the inferences he has drawn from the texts of Scripture he has selected, and that, notwithstanding the plausibility of his arguments against the Trinitarian system; it stands upon a firm, and immovable basis, "and || the gates of hell shall never prevail against it."

In his second chapter, Mr. K. labours to establish what he calls, "THE UNITY OR ONENESS OF GOD," and observes, that a plurality of persons in the Godhead is "a sentiment utterly repugnant to reason and true religion." I grant that it is utterly repugnant to the sentiments of Arius, Socinus, Dr. Priestley, and Mr. K; § but that it is repugnant to reason and true religion remains to be proved.

Mr.

* John xvi. 15. † John x. 30. || Matt. xvi. 18.

§ To shew the fallacy and weakness of Mr. K's note, Page the 9th, I shall quote the latter part of it. "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. John i. 1. Not the God he was with,

Mr. K. here represents our sentiments in as unfavorable a light as he well can, charging us with, what he conceives to be, the consequences of our doctrine (viz.) that we worship "three Gods." However, I trust we are better established in *that* essential article of the Christian faith, that, "There* are *three* that bear Record in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and *these three are one*;" than to renounce it because he ridicules it.

With regard to the passages he has quoted, there is not one that proves his point; for it is not said, in any of them, "there is but one person who is the object of supreme worship, and with, because if that were the case it would be to say, In the beginning was God, and God was with himself, and God was himself." It is true Mr. K. neither you nor any man living, can explain this passage agreeable to the Arian system, without putting common sense to the rack, and exposing the weakness of your cause: But when it is explained, (as it ought to be) in conformity to the subsequent context and other passages of Scripture, it proves, to a demonstration, that although the Word, which was in the beginning with God, [the Father] is not the same person; yet he is another person, who is of the same essence with the Father: For it should be remarked; it is not said, the Word was a god, no, but positively, THE WORD WAS GOD, even the Word that was made flesh and dwelt among us.

* 1 John v. 7.

in no danger of ascribing "that to him which that one person is God the Father;" no, nor yet any thing that implies it; so that all he has said upon them is mere supposition. Nay there is one of them which according to his own sentiment, militates against what he has attempted to prove. "One* Spirit. One Lord,† One God and Father of all." Now Mr. K. acknowledges that the One Lord spoken of is Jesus Christ, exclusive of the Father, for he observes, that "there is a clear distinction preserved, &c." Now, according to his supposition, the title Lord belongs to Christ, and not to the Father, and if so, it necessarily follows that he is, in the highest sense of the word the adorable Jehovah. However, the title Lord, or Jehovah, is more frequently given to the Father than to the Son.

He takes it for granted that the point is settled in his favour, where he says "Jesus tells us that the Father *only*, in distinction from himself, is this one Spirit." But here his zeal seems to have carried him too far; therefore, in order to moderate it, I would recommend to him another perusal of the passage,§ and it is to be hoped, that will convince him of his misrepresentation.

* Eph. iv. 4, 5, 6.

† The manner in which Mr. K. has quoted this passage cannot be justified. The Apostle says ONE LORD, but HE has post fixed Jesus Christ to it, and represented it, as though it stood so in Scripture.

§ John iv. 24.

of it. " This shews at once the wretchedness of *his* system, when the abettor of it, is obliged to have recourse to such unwarrantable subterfuges for its support."

Although he asserts, " That it is a false idea to suppose that there are three persons each of them God, &c ;" the Scripture nevertheless, speaks of God in the plural number, even according to our translation,* in more than one place. " And† God said let *us* make man in *our* image after *our* likeness—Behold‡ the man is become as one of *us*. Go § to let *us* go down and there confound their language. Whom|| shall I send; who will go for *us*. Now as Mr. K. seems to lay great stress upon the words *one* and *he*, it may not be improper, but may prove of service to him, to pay some attention to the word *us*.

The inference he draws page 7, is, in my opinion, equally absurd with the manner in which he attempts to prove his assertion. His words are, " I can but observe, that these passages seem to point out that God is one active being, by which I mean he is not two beings or

* The original word, which our translators have rendered God, is plural, and occurs no less than thirty-two times, in the first chapter of Genesis.

† Gen. i. 26.

‡ Gen. iii. 22.

§ Chap. xi. 7.

|| Isaiah vi. 8.

persons,

persons;—nor three hundred.” Wonderful! what Trinitarian ever supposed it? But how absurd is it, for a person to attempt to measure the Deity by Mathematics, or Philosophy: It shows at once that human wisdom has gained, in his heart, the ascendancy over the truth as it is in Jesus; and that he lays more stress upon, what he conceives to be according to reason, than upon those important things which God has revealed, because he has wisely kept from us the manner in which they exist.

Chap. III. The ground which Mr. K. goes upon in this chapter, to prove that Christ is inferior to the Father, is, that there are three degrees of worship; “civil, subordinate and supreme.” If I were not well assured that he is averse to popery, I should suspect, that he had imbibed, some of the errors of the Church of Rome; as that Church allows of, or rather prescribes a subordinate worship, to the Virgin Mary, departed Saints, &c. But let him point out a passage, where that subordinate worship is prescribed, or even allowed of, in Scripture.*

The passages he refers to proves to a demonstration, the badness of the cause he has undertaken to vindicate. The first is 1 Chron. xxix. 20. This passage, according to the manner he

* Till this is done, we shall justly reject the idea as erroneous.

has quoted, and *represented it, proves too much, namely, that the Israelites worshipped the king, not only in the place that was set apart for the public worship of God; but even in the very same act of worship; which, in my opinion, is no less than blasphemy to suppose. The words of the text are as follows; "And† all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord § and the king." I think it is more consistent with Scripture and reason, to suppose that the king joined with the people in the worship of God, than it is to suppose that he himself received adoration.

"Herod || (he tells us) wanted to see the young child, that he might worship him;" and adds "there can I think be no doubt but he had in view civil worship." Is it not surprising, that Mr. K. should refer to the words of a wicked, and cruel king, to prove his point? and especially to an expression which proceeded from a heart fraught with hypocrisy. For it is evident,

* How strange is it that Mr. K. should quote the passage in the following manner, "The Israelites worshipped God and the King."

† 1 Chron. xxix. 20.

§ The people bowed down and worshipped the Lord, and the king bowed down and worshipped the Lord with them. This I apprehend to be the meaning of the text.

|| Matt. ii. 8.

that

that he had no intention to pay him any kind of worship; but under the pretence of worshipping him, sought to imbrue his hands in his blood. But even here, it is worthy of observation, that the worship which Herod pretended, was the same which the wise men from the East intended; and what that worship was is proved by matter of fact, ver. 11; where observe, it is not said that they paid him civil respect; nor that they offered to him a subordinate worship; no, but positively, they "fell* down and worshipped him."

The circumstance "of the debtor and creditor," is determinable in its own nature; otherwise it was wrong† for the former to worship the latter: but it should be observed, that, the passage is a parable, and not matter of fact. "Therefore § is the kingdom of heaven, says our Lord, likened unto a certain king, &c." Now it is evident that by the certain king, we are to understand the King of heaven; and therefore the worship spoken of is supreme worship; for our Lord does not use the word (worship) in the 29th verse, where the debtor is represented as falling down at the feet of his fellow servant,

* Matt. ii. 11.

† There are many circumstances related in Scripture, which are absolutely sinful; although they are not censured, in the places where they are mentioned.

§ Matt. xviii. 23.

and

and intreating him to have patience with him : Mr. K. should rather have referred to this part of the parable ; but he knew it would not answer his purpose, because the word worship is not in it ; and therefore, rather than not have a passage of Scripture to produce, he quotes one which shows at once the erroneouſness of his hypothesis, and his inattention to Scripture. That Christ was * worshipped when upon earth he cannot deny ; and therefore, in order to prove that he did not receive supreme worship, which however he has not done, he grants the Roman Catholics all they contend for ; when they attempt to vindicate their idolatry, in worshipping Saints, Images, &c. for they tell us, they do not pay them supreme, but subordinate worship.

In order to prove, that what Mr. K. calls, subordinate worship, is not enjoined, or allowed of, in Scripture ; I shall refer the reader to two passages. “ And † as Peter was coming in, Cornelius met him, and fell down at his feet, and worshipped him. But Peter took him up, saying, Stand up, I myself also am a man.” Now we cannot reasonably suppose, that Cornelius intended to offer him supreme worship ; his judgment was, no doubt, better informed than

* There are no less than seventy-three texts of Scripture, which prove, either directly or indirectly, that Christ was, and must be, worshipped.

† Acts x. 25, 26.

to imbibe such a sentiment : and yet he detested the idea of receiving, even, subordinate worship, well knowing that worship belongs to God alone.

The second passage is one which he has quoted, page 11, to prove that supreme worship ought not to be offered to the Son. “ And * I fell down at his feet to worship him. And he said unto me, see, thou do it not : I am thy fellow servant, and of thy brethren that have the testimony of Jesus : Worship God.” Now we cannot be so ignorant, as to suppose St. John intended supreme worship ; he had been taught, that, *that* is due to God, and to no other besides ; and yet the Angel refused to receive subordinate worship ; well knowing that it was idolatry, to bow down to, or worship any creature. It is farther observable, that our Lord never reprov'd any who fell down to worship him ; which he certainly would have done, had he not been the supreme God.

Page the 10th. Several texts are quoted, much supposed, and but little proved. The first is, “ Thou† shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve. Mr. K. is very confident that this can only refer to God the Father ; but St. Paul, it seems, was of a different

* Rev. xix, 10. † Deut. vi. 13, 14.

opinion, for he declared that he, and all the primitive Christians, served "the* Lord Christ," as well as the Father.

Another passage which he has quoted, is part of the exhortation our Lord gave his disciples. "Whatsoever† ye shall ask the Father in my name he will give it you." We allow, that, according to Scripture, and the plan of redemption, it is most proper, to pray to God the Father in the name of Jesus; because he is the "one‡ mediator between God and men:" nevertheless, our Lord, in the same discourse, assures his disciples, that HE will || do for them, any thing they "shall ask in his name," intimating thereby, not only that the Father and he—are both of one mind; but that they have equal power. This is confirmed by St. Paul; who declares, that Christ "is** the head of all principality and power:" now as Christ is the head of ALL POWER, it necessarily follows, that there is no superior power: nevertheless, Mr. K. would insinuate, that, because Christ is mediator between God and man, he must of necessity be inferior to the Father, even "in his highest capacity;" but this he has not proved; nor does it follow, that a mediator must, necessarily, be inferior to the offended party; and therefore, what he has

* Col. iii. 24. † John xv. 16. § 1 Tim. ii. 5.

|| John xiv. 14. ** Col. ii. 10.

asserted, is merely playing upon words. Besides he has drawn his conclusions, without first proving that his premises are right ; a practice, too common in controversy, but absolutely ridiculous.

The passage he has quoted from Isaiah, will, in my opinion, be of but little service to his cause ; for by the " Holy* ONE of Israel," many wise and good men, understand Christ ; coming, and taking up his abode with his people, walking in the midst of his church upon earth ; and continuing with it, " alway even to the end of the world ;" and I think there can be no doubt of the " Holy ONE of Israel," being the " LORD† OF HOSTS," whose glory the Prophet saw, as he in another place informs us : and *that* passage, St. John has explained, much better than I can. " These‡ things Esaias said, when he saw his glory and spake of him." I know, those who deny the equality of Christ with the Father, will not allow that it belongs to him ; but we must have better proof, than they have, as yet, given, before we alter our sentiments.

Page 12. He again produces the passage which is explained Page 15, viz. John xvii. 3.

Ibid. He informs us, " There is but one self-existent first cause, infinitely perfect, worthy of

* Isaiah xii. 6. † Chapter vi. 5. ‡ John xii. 41.

the supreme regard of all intelligent beings." I do not know that any Trinitarian denies this; but what does it prove? not that there is but one person in the Godhead; nor that Christ is not equal with the Father, and therefore, Mr. K. might have spared himself the trouble of quoting Scripture to confirm it, because it would have been granted him, upon his own bare assertion.

He farther observes, that, "God is to be worshipped, having the original grounds of our highest services underivedly in himself." This we do not deny, but it is no proof, that Christ, as touching his divine nature, is inferior to God the Father, for although, as mediator, his fulness is derived from the Father, it is evident that he possessed glory, in equality, with the Father before the world was. Hence, in his state of humiliation, he prayed, "O * Father glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had WITH THEE, before the world was." As to "The ground of our worship of Christ, resting upon the command of God the Father," it is, I think, a sufficient proof of his being God, in the highest sense of the word, as the Father would not command us to worship a mere creature; nor would he even permit us to worship the Son, if he were not equal with him; for he declares himself to be "a † jealous God,"

* John xvii. 5. † Exodus xx. 5.

and consequently will not give his glory to a creature.

But the most evident proof the badness of Mr. K's cause, is the manner in which he has quoted the following passage. "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive [of God] power, wisdom, riches, strength, &c." I shall quote the passage as it is recorded in Scripture, and then make a few remarks upon it. "Worthy* is the Lamb that was slain to receive power and riches and wisdom and strength and honour and glory and blessing." Now I would observe, in the first place, that the same things are here ascribed to the Son, as are ascribed to the Father, chap. iv. 11; i. e. honour and glory and power; and secondly, the Father is said to be worthy to receive these things as well as the Son. "Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive, &c." Now if Mr. K's construction is admitted, I would ask, who is God the Father worthy to receive glory and honour and power from? The answer would be, I presume, "From all who worship him, or who are the happy partakers of his benefits." Then, surely, the same is meant when these things are ascribed to the Son; for the worshippers are not speaking of what he is worthy to receive of them: and hence, in ver. 13, we have a striking, and beautiful representation of all the worshippers in heaven above, and in the

* Rev. v. 12.

earth beneath, ascribing the very same things conjointly, which had been before ascribed separately, "To him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb:" where, observe, First, They are represented as worshipping the Lamb, in the same act of worship with the Father. Secondly, They ascribe the same things to him, and, Thirdly, They extend the duration of the worship, which each is worthy to receive, to equal length, "For ever and ever." Therefore his reasoning appears to me as weak, as the doctrine which he has taken upon him to defend is erroneous. It is true, he endeavours to explain himself, at the conclusion of the chapter: where he informs us, that "Christ is worshipped, not as God self-existent, but as the exalted Lamb of God that was slain." O ye lovers of truth, who are earnestly desirous of being made wise unto salvation; let not this Unitarian deceive you; for if Christ is worshipped by *Angels and Archangels, and all the glorious company of heaven, surely he ought to be worshipped, by all for whom he hath been slain upon earth; but if he be not God, equal with the Father, do not dare to bow down before him: worship him not, at the peril of your souls: trust not in him; for in so doing you will involve yourselves under a heavy and

* Heb. i. 6.

dreadful *curse.† But if on the contrary he be really and truly God, of the same nature and essence with the Father (and he certainly is, if the Scriptures may be depended upon) then, be not afraid of being guilty of idolatry in worshipping him. § For “Unto whom should ye go” but unto him, he “Hath the words of eternal life.” Yea, “He || is Lord of all.” Lord of his church in particular, and therefore he is commanded to worship him.**

Chap. IV. Treats of THE PERSON AND IDENTITY OF CHRIST, commencing with the observation, that, “The title of this chapter may seem singular, as if it were possible for christians to have inconsistent opinions relating to that Divine Being Jesus Christ.” I confess, that the title of the chapter appears to me a little uncommon; but the author has fully convinced me, that it is possible for Christians to have inconsistent opinions relating to Jesus Christ; for he acknowledges that he is “The object of our faith,” and yet believes him to be a mere creature.

* Jer. xvii. 5.

† On the other hand, that man is pronounced blessed, “Who trusteth in the Lord, and whose hope the Lord is.” Compare Jer. xvii. 7. and 1 Tim. i. 1.

§ John vi. 68. || Acts x. 36. ** Psalm xlv. 11.

I grant

I grant, "It is not becoming the christian to make our crucified Redeemer any thing the fruitful imagination can invent;" and therefore it is not without just cause that Mr. K. seems displeased with those who had such absurd ideas of him in the second century. But, I would ask, were not those persons deemed hereticks, on account of their absurd belief? and were not the orthodox christians of Trinitarian sentiments?

Page the 14th. He supposes that "The misapprehension arises, not from the sacred scriptures, but from wrong apprehensions, by which realities are confounded, and the sacred scriptures thrown into obscurity." It is certainly right, that we should endeavour to get our judgment well informed, concerning "Who Jesus Christ is," and "in what relation he stands to us." But still, upon the supposition of his not being equal with the Father, the Scriptures are thrown into much greater obscurity and contradiction. I believe, with the late Mr. Hervey, that any man, unacquainted with christianity, beginning to read the Scriptures with a desire to know their true meaning, could not fail to find the divinity and sacrifice of Christ. They would inform him, of the *glory which he had from everlasting—of the worship he received from Angels and Archangels, whom he had created,

* Psalm xlv. 6.

when* he laid the foundations of the earth,
 “ When the morning stars sang together, and all
 the Sons of God shouted for joy ” — Of the
 Lord of glory † coming from heaven, to ac-
 complish the great work of man’s redemption—
 taking upon him our nature—submitting, “ For
 the suffering of death,” to be “ made ‡ a little
 lower than the Angels ” —and in this state of
 humiliation evidencing that he was man, having
 both a human § body and a human || soul—that
 he was “ A man of sorrows, and acquainted
 with grief.” They would inform him that he
 **expired upon the cross—that he was laid in
 the grave—that he †† rose from the dead on the
 third day—that he §§ ascended into heaven, to
 be our advocate with the Father; our |||| great
 high priest, who “ ever ||† liveth to make inter-
 cession for us,” and who “ is able also to save
 them to the uttermost, that come unto God [the
 Father] by him.” They would inform him that
 he shall come again at the end of the world to
 raise the dead—that he shall then †* change the
 vile bodies of his saints “ that they may be
 fashioned like unto his glorious body, according
 to the working whereby he is able even to sub-
 due all things unto himself ” —that he shall then
 †§ judge the world, and give unto every man ac-

* Job xxxviii. 4, 7. † John xvi. 28. ‡ Heb. ii. 9.

§ John i. 14. || Matt. xxvi. 38. ** John xix. 30.

†† Matt. xxviii. 6. §§ Eph. iv. 8. ||| John ii. 8.

||† Heb. vii. 27. †* Rom. ii. 6. †§ Rev. xxi. 6.

cording

according to his works—and that this great person, is “Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end, the first and the last, the Lord which is, and which was, and which is to come, **THE ALMIGHTY.**” I would ask any person of common sense, what inference this man could draw from the foregoing passages of Scripture; but that Christ is both God and Man: tell him that he is either God and not Man, or Man and not God; and he will despair of finding the truth in a book, the meaning of which, is so contrary to the letter. I have been informed that the Jew who engaged in controversy with Dr. Priestley, acknowledged that if he believed the New Testament, he *must* believe that Christ is God, equal with the Father.

The Scriptures which Mr. K. has quoted to prove that Jesus Christ is one conscious being, by no means prove that he is not equal with the Father. “And * she (Mary) shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.” Does not this passage prove that important truth which this author attempts to overthrow? that Christ is the great God, and Saviour of his people. For those who are saved from their sins are the † people of God; and in the text, they are said to be the people of Christ; therefore, it necessarily follows, that Christ is God.

* Matt. ii. 21.

† Heb. iv. 9.

“ Then

"Then § cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan to be baptized of him,"—"And lo a voice from heaven, saying, this is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." I am at a loss to know what Mr. K. intends to infer from the former part of this quotation, (for he has not told us) unless it is, that, because Jesus came to be baptized of John, he must therefore be inferior to the Father. The latter part carries its own evidence along with it; for if Christ is declared by God the Father to be his **BELOVED SON**, he must be of the same nature.

The other passages chiefly refer to Christ as mediator and judge; but not one of them proves his inferiority to the Father.

We do not object to what he says upon Rev. i. 8. concerning Christ being one person, or as he expresses it, one "conscious agent;" but we must give up a considerable part of our Bible, as Dr. Priestley has done, (and I suppose Mr. K. too) if we cease to believe that he has two natures, divine and human.

As Mr. K. seems to have no objection to "Join with the great apostle John (1 Eph. ii. 22.) I hope he will not object to join with him chap. iii. 16. ver. 7, 12, 20. and then, I

§ Matt, iii. 13—17.

am persuaded, the controversy between him and Trinitarians will soon subside.

If he has met with any Trinitarian author, who divides "The person of Christ," so as to make him two conscious beings; let him produce fair quotations from that author; till this is done we shall suspect, and not without reason, that the idea sprang from his fruitful imagination; that he has palmed it upon us, and endeavoured, upon that ground, to make our sentiments appear ridiculous to the world: this is something similar to the practice of those persecutors, who dressed Christians up in Bearskins, in order that they might have a more plausible pretence for beating them.

Our asserting Christ is God and Man, united in one person, is neither "An idle fancy," or without "Foundation in the word of God;" and I am surprised that any man, who professes to believe the Scriptures, should have the least doubt concerning it. That Christ in speaking of himself sometimes alludes to his Godhead and sometimes to his manhood is evident, and I think will appear clear from the following passages of Scripture.

* "I and my Father are one. † Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true.

* John x. 30. † Chap. viii. 14.

E

Ye

* Ye cannot tell whence I come, and whither I go. My † Father is greater than I. If ‡ I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true. Ye § both know me, and ye know whence I am."

Mr. K. having complained of consequences, which, according to his apprehension, must follow the belief of the Trinity, he says, "I can then but conclude, that the distinction in this respect made is by Trinitarians, indefensible from Scripture, disgraceful to the blessed Jesus, and pregnant with consequences fatal to the simplicity of a christian character."

It is true, there is a possibility of representing the sentiments of those who do not agree with us, however orthodox, in such colours as will make them appear odious to the world; but Mr. K. does not argue so much against what Trinitarians really hold, as against what he has palmed upon them, a method not only repugnant to the christian character; but even to common honesty.

According to his ideas, the distinction which is put between the divine and human nature of Christ, (for that is the ground Trinitarians go upon) "cannot by any means be admissible."

* John viii. 14. † Chap. xiv. 28. ‡ Chap. v. 31.

§ Chap. vii. 28.

Perhaps not by Mr. K. who is determined not to admit it, but this does not prove it unscriptural; and I defy him, or any other Arian, Socinian, or Unitarian so called, to overthrow it; for if this distinction is not to be admitted, why is our Saviour called both the Son of God and the Son of Man?

To conclude, the unfair manner in which this writer has represented our sentiments—the weak manner in which he argues against what Trinitarians do not believe*—and the absurd inferences he has drawn from those premisses will, I trust, serve to confirm us in the truths of the Gospel; and especially in that important truth, which he has endeavoured to explode; but which our Lord has confirmed, in declaring **I AND MY FATHER ARE ONE.**

Chapter five, Mr. K. undertakes to prove that “**JESUS CHRIST [is] A DISTINCT BEING FROM GOD THE FATHER.**” We shall be glad to know what he means by “A distinct Being:” If he means a distinct person, I do not know that any Trinitarian will contradict him; but if he means a being of another nature,

* We are far from being convinced, that Mr. K. has confuted what he has palmed upon us; as even the out works of Trinitarianism are invulnerable to his attacks: “If thou hast run with the footmen and they have wearied thee, how canst thou contend with horses?”

different to God the Father, he has asserted what he neither hath or can prove.

As most of the arguments in this chapter are already answered, I shall not follow the writer regularly through it ; but shall take notice of all that remains unanswered.

In the note (page 20.) he informs us, he " Is aware of the common evasion of Trinitarians, who when pressed home with the force of this argument, (viz. that Christ cannot be God in the highest and fullest import of the term) shift their ground and say, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost together make but one God." But here Mr. K. is mistaken, as they do not shift their ground in asserting this ; for it is the foundation they always built upon, and while they keep on it, I have no doubt but they will be able, if not to convince, at least, to confute, those who attempt to rob the Messiah of his Deity. That each person is God, is evident from Scripture ; and it is likewise as evident, that they together make but one God : but in what a childish manner does this author reason, in saying, " They are only parts of a God and, if one is [were] wanting the God would be incomplete." Is it possible for one to be wanting, when all necessarily existed from eternity ? I hope before he attempts to defend his unscriptural system again, he will take care, not to sneer at those truths which he cannot answer,

Mr. K.

Mr. K. would fain make us believe, that God and Christ, are distinct objects of faith, and that we may believe in one, and not in the other: his words are as follow. "Though both were objects of faith, yet they were distinct objects of faith, and there might be a belief in the one and not in the other." To this I answer, that, although those who are convinced of the being of a God, and of that God being a rewarder of them that diligently seek him, may, not having heard of Christ, believe in the Father and not in the Son; yet it is impossible, under the gospel dispensation, savingly to believe in the one, without the other. Had the Jews believed in God the Father, as they ought, they would not have rejected his Son; for as those who despise Christ, despise him that sent him; so those who believe on him, believe on the Father also.

In his remarks upon Phil. ii. 6. and Col. i. 15. he says, "Christ cannot be the God he was in the image and form of. To this I answer, Christ is no where said (as Mr. K. would insinuate) to be in the image of God; but positively "The* image of the invisible God," and in another place, "The† express image of his person." Now, although Christ is a distinct person from the Father, yet, it is evident that he possesseth all that is necessary to constitute him

* Col. i. 15. † Heb. i. 3.

an object of supreme worship; for, as I have already proved, his being in the form of God, is not spoken of him as in his state of humiliation, for in that he was made a little lower than the Angels; but prior to it, when he thought it not robbery to be equal with God. From this statement of the matter, I draw the following inference; that Christ being in the form of God, evidences him to be a distinct person from the Father; and being the express image of his person, evidences him to be essentially of the same nature.

The distinction which he puts between the worship of God and Christ in heaven, is already answered; and, I confess, I begin to grow weary of so much tautology: If a multitude of texts might be brought to prove his point, as he insinuates, (Page 2.) why does he so often mention the same over again? I think it plainly shows, that the passages in his favor, are not quite so numerous as he at first apprehended. But does this writer represent the distinction between the Father and the Son, in the manner Trinitarians hold it? Why does he attempt to darken council by words without knowledge? Had he stated our sentiments in their true light, no such consequences, as he has intimated, would have followed. Christ would neither "Come from himself—go to himself—send himself—obey himself—nor be with himself, and in himself."

How

How far he has followed our Lord's excellent precept, I leave the reader to judge : If, as he would have us believe, the Trinitarian system " Makes the dear Saviour of mankind to countenance and support every kind of equivocation," he seems not to have been wanting in availing him of the indulgence ; but let him remember, that in so doing he injures the cause he has undertaken to defend.

Chapter fix. In the title of this chap. Mr. K. informs us of what he intends to prove ; THAT JESUS CHRIST, THE SON OF GOD, IS A BEING INFERIOR TO, AND DEPENDENT ON THE FATHER. He begins with observing, that " The Lord Jesus Christ received his being and existence from the Father ; and takes it for granted, that God being, " Called his Father and Jesus his only begotten Son," conveys to us such a meaning. But to this it may be answered, that Christ being the only begotten Son of his Father, is not to be understood as of natural generation ; but simply that the Son is of the Father ; or, to use the expression of an inspired writer, is in the bosom of the Father. He appears to be confident that the Son was brought into existence in time ; but acknowledges that he cannot, " Define the manner of the Son's being brought into existence." Here Mr. K. frankly acknowledges that he believes what he cannot define : however, if we
are

are to understand it according to his ideas, it appears to me no hard matter to give some satisfactory definition.

What is advanced, page 23. concerning the Father having given the Son to have life in himself, is already answered.

He supposes, because Christ is called * the beginning of the creation of God, and the first-born of every creature, that he must necessarily be a creature, "Though he himself is neither said to be created nor called a creature." To this I answer; by the creation of God, in this place, we are rather to understand the new creation, in which we are † created in Christ Jesus unto good works; for of this, § Jesus is the author and finisher, as he begins the good work, and carries it on. But admitting we are to understand it of the creation in general, it does not prove what Mr. K. intends; for Christ is not said to be the first thing that God created, therefore it must be understood of him actively, and not in the passive sense: Christ is said to be "The first and the last," so that it might with as much propriety be asserted, that he was the last creature which God created, if we are to understand it passively; however it is evident from his own words, that he was always a co-worker with his Father, in all things that were

* Rev. iii. 14. † Eph. ii. 10. § Heb. xii. 2.

made; "My* Father worketh hitherto and I work." Christ being called the first-born of every creature, evidently proves that he is not a creature: had he been called the first-born of every other creature, Arians and Socinians would have had a more plausible reason for asserting, that he must necessarily be one: It appears to me, that this is rather to be understood spiritually, that Christ taking upon him our nature, and being born of a woman, is the cause of our being born again, born of God, or that ~~he~~ being raised from the dead, is the cause of our rising from a death of sin to a life of righteousness: for it is worthy to be noticed, that he is called the first-born, or first begotten of the Father; only in reference to this. "Thou† art my Son this day have I begotten thee;" referring to his resurrection from the dead: "I§ will make him, my first-born, higher than the kings of the earth:" evidently referring to his state of exaltation, after his death and resurrection, in which he governs the world in general, and his church, in particular: besides, we should observe, that the first does not always signify priority; but sometimes the greatest, or most eminent; for first begotten and only begotten, are synonymous terms in the Scriptures. Christ is said to be || the first begotten from the dead, and yet it is evident that others were raised from the dead before him;

* John v. 17. † Psalm ii. 7. § Psalm lxxxix. 27.

|| Rev. i. 5.

he is called the *only begotten of the Father, nevertheless all believers are said to be †begotten to a lively or living hope; ‡begotten of God the Father; therefore as these expressions may be taken, with as much propriety, one way as the other, Mr. K. cannot infer from them, that Christ was brought into existence in time, or that there ever was a time when he did not exist.

The passages quoted to prove, that Christ receives from the Father all that he possesseth; evidently refer to his state of humiliation, in which state he received commandment of his Father; and to his office as Mediator, in which capacity he hath all power given unto him in heaven and in earth: but this does not prove that, as touching his *divine* nature, he is inferior to the Father; therefore the inferences Mr. K. has drawn, are inconclusive.

He supposes farther, that because, "knowledge is derived by Christ from God" the Father, he must therefore be his inferior; and observes, "That though Christ knew all things necessary for him to know, yet his knowledge *was* *progressive*, and owing to the communications of God the Father." Is Mr. K. in earnest here! has he forgotten what he has ac-

* John iii. 16. † 1 Pet. i. 3. ‡ James i. 18.

knowledge? i. e. that Christ existed before "All other of God's productions," and can he suppose that he came into this world to improve in knowledge? How absurd! We allow that as man, Christ was capable of growing in knowledge, as well as in stature; but as God his understanding is infinite; yea, "In* him are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

He farther takes it for granted, that he has excluded both natures of Christ, from the knowledge, "Of the day of judgment;" because our Lord says, "Of † that day and that hour knoweth no man, no not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son but the Father." It appears to me that he is mistaken in his supposition, that Christ (according to the division Trinitarians contend for) excludes himself as man, when he says of that day and that hour knoweth no man; for there is no doubt, but he speaks of the men upon earth, with the same reference, as he speaks of the Angels in heaven; not including himself in the number of either: but after having spoken of men and Angels, he mentions himself; "Neither the Son." Now if it can be proved that Christ as God, knew the day of judgment; then it will follow that he spoke of his human nature only.

* Col. ii. 3.

† Mark xiii. 32.

Whether the apostles understood our Lord aright, when he spoke these words, I shall not take upon me to determine ; (for he spoke many things which they understood not, till after he was risen from the dead :) but it is evident, that they looked upon him as the supreme God ; and hence we read of one acknowledging him to be his *Lord and his God ; and consequently an object of supreme worship ; and of another acknowledging him to be omniscient ; “ Lord † thou knowest all things ;” but if he did not know the day of judgment ; would he have suffered his Apostle who was about to publish the gospel to the world, to have retained such an error ; would he not have told him he was mistaken, that although he supposed he knew all things, yet there was one thing (the day of judgment) which he did not know : but our Lord did not at all contradict him, so that we may safely conclude, that the Apostle spoke truly, and that there is nothing, not even the day of judgment hid from him, “ Who ‡ searcheth the reins and hearts, and who will give to every one according to his works.”

The expressions of our Lord, in the latter part of the Revelation indicate, that, as God, he knew the day of judgment, “ And § behold

* John xx. 28. † Chap. xxi. 17. ‡ Rev. ii. 23.

§ Chap. xxii. 12.

I come quickly and my reward is with me, to give to every man according as his works shall be." *He, Jesus, which testifieth these things saith, surely, I COME QUICKLY. If he was ignorant of the time, how did he know that he should come quickly? We may therefore safely conclude, that although Christ, as man, did not know the day of judgement, yet as † Jehovah, which is, and which was, and which is to come, § all things, without exception, are naked and open before his eyes.

Because honors are communicated from God to Christ, Mr. K. concludes, that he must therefore be his inferior. But it should be remarked, that the passages he has quoted refer to the exaltation of Christ, after he had died for our sins and rose again for our justification; and that these honors were conferred upon his human nature, which alone was capable of being exalted, as a reward for what he had done and suffered, and therefore, it is impossible, according to God's wisdom in redeeming the world, that there should be "Any like communication of honor from Christ to the Father."

He observes lastly, that the dominion of Christ is the gift of the Father; "He, God hath given all things into his hand," and he in-

* Rev. xxii. 20. † Rev. i. 8. § Heb. iv. 13.

forms us, "It was so predicted of him, Psalm ii. 8." "Ask of me, and I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession. Thou shalt break them in pieces like a potter's vessel." This passage points out to us, the authority which the Father has given the Son over the world in general, and over his church in particular; but here it is necessary to enquire, into the causes of this wonderful effect; and it is plain, they were, Christ coming into this world, taking our nature upon him, and in the form of a servant doing the will, and suffering the pleasure of his heavenly Father. This is confirmed by the passage Mr. K. has quoted. "Thou* hast loved righteousness and hated iniquity; therefore God, even thy God hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness:" "he became," † saith St. Paul, "obedient unto death." From hence it follows, that the dominion which the Father hath given to Christ, was given him in consequence of his becoming man; and this our Lord confirms in the following words; "And § hath given him authority to execute judgement also, because he is the Son of man." Now, according to the Arian, or Unitarian system, it would have been more proper for him, to have assigned as a reason, his being the Son of God; but in that capacity, he possessed equal dominion,

* Psalm xlv. 7. † Heb. i. 9. § 1 John v. 27.

power, and glory with the Father before the world began; and consequently could not have that conferred upon him which he had already in possession.

The expressions of Jesus Christ, "Relative to himself," prove that he is inferior to the Father, as touching his manhood; but not in regard to his divine nature; and therefore, without stronger proof, we cannot admit what Mr. K. has asserted, viz. that when Christ speaks of himself, he means the whole of himself; i. e. both natures. However, in order that what he says may carry some plausibility with it, he has recourse to his old stratagem of two persons; which no Trinitarian author, that I have read, ever affirmed: and then he endeavours to represent to the public, the consequences which must follow. But as I have fully answered all he has advanced upon the subject page 44. I refer the reader to it.

He is very confident that God was in Christ; but if any one were to ask him to explain himself, and define the manner how God was in Christ; * I believe, he would find himself at a greater loss, than he would in defining "The

F 2

manner

* Many appear to have been drawn away from the Trinity of Revelation by an abuse of abstract reasoning: that is by presuming upon an analogy, which does not exist, between mathematical truth, and all other truth. We have

seen

manner of the Son's being brought into existence.* It appears to me that God being in Christ, and Christ being but one person, sufficiently proves that Christ is God.

Although we allow that, "There is but one Jesus Christ," and that he is the same at all times; yet, the work of redemption, which he undertook in our behalf, speaking after the manner of men, occasioned some alteration in his state: St. Paul informs us, that "He[†] was rich" and "Became poor;" that he was "In[†] the form of God," and "Took upon him the form of a servant;" that, although he created

seen it argued, seriously in appearance, that three cannot be one in divinity, because it is not so in arithmetic. But we are here to distinguish: the mathematical sciences give us rules by which all quantities are to be measured; but when those rules are applied by analogy to the qualities of things, they must fail us, and the experiment is always hazardous. The specific difference between gold and lead, with the respective value of each, is an object of mathematical consideration; but the difference between good and evil is not; for these latter are to be compared and estimated as qualities. God in his nature and his perfections can never be considered under any idea we have of quantity. We know him and describe him by his attributes; all of which are qualities, original in him, and infinite in themselves. It must therefore be extremely dangerous to speak of God, and borrow our ideas from terms applied to quantity of any kind. See the charge intended to be delivered by the late Bishop of Norwich to his Clergy.

* 2 Cor. viii. 9.

† Phil. ii. 7.

* all things, and his throne was for ever and ever; he was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death: in a word, he is said to be of the † fruit of David's loins, *according to the flesh*, and yet "David in spirit called him ‡ LORD." These passages clearly prove, what we contend for, that Christ is of two natures, divine and human; and that when the Scriptures speak of him, they refer sometimes to one, and sometimes to the other.

What is advanced page 28. requires some attention. There is one passage of Scripture, upon which Mr. K. seems to lay the greatest stress. "*My § Father is greater than I.*" Here he exclaims as though the victory was already obtained; "Turn *which* passage about a || thousand ways, the truth of it remains: and in every respect in which the Father is greater, (the fact asserted is) in all those respects the Son *is and must be the less.*" Here Mr. K. and I agree, viz, that in every respect, in which the Father is greater, the Son is, and must be the less; but I confess, I see no necessity for turning the passage about at all; I shall therefore let it remain, and

* Col. i. 16. † Acts ii. 30. ‡ Psalm cx. 1.

§ John xiv. 28. || Heb. ii. 9.

|| Had Mr. K. been conversant in Arithmetic, particularly in *Permutation*; he would have known that it is impossible to vary a sentence of *six* words, more than seven hundred and twenty times.

consider our blessed Redeemer in his state of humiliation: In the form of a servant, which he took upon him in time: or if you please, as our Mediator; and in all these respects, his Father is the greater. But it should be noticed, that our Lord speaks in the present tense; he does not say, *my Father ever was greater than I, nor is there any particular in which I am equal with him.* Now as there are other passages of Scripture, which assert the equality of Christ with the Father; I think the most rational inference that can be drawn from the passage, is that he spoke of his office as Mediator, which he was about to enter upon; as he declares in the preceding sentence, "Because * I go unto my Father."

The answer our Lord gave, when the request of Zebedee's children was made by their mother; does not seem to have been properly understood by Mr. K. It should be observed, that they had ideas of our Lord becoming a powerful, temporal prince, and that he intended to confer temporal honors upon his disciples; therefore he gave them to understand that his kingdom was not of this world, and that it did not belong to him, to appoint statesmen their places in earthly monarchies; for he came into the world upon a different errand. But as it is probable this explication will not be admitted, by those

* John xij. 12.

who deny that Christ is equal with the Father; I shall meet them upon their own ground, in supposing that our Lord referred to his kingdom of glory: and here we should remark, that God is no respecter of persons; and that no one can enter into the kingdom of heaven, much less sit down on the throne of Christ, without complying with those conditions, which are prescribed in the gospel: and therefore our Lord might truly say, "To sit on my right-hand and on my left is not mine to give." And Mr. K. seems to be of the same opinion; for in his remark upon the text, he tells us, "He was not yet ascended, nor had yet assumed the sacred province of judging mankind, and assigning them their particular situations in the other world." Does he really believe that Christ assumed this province when he ascended? If so, I hope he will no longer deny that he knew the day of judgement. However our Lord has explained himself upon this subject; "To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne."

From hence it appears, that although Christ, as man, could do nothing of himself, separate from and independent of the Father: yet "As the Father raiseth up the dead, and quickeneth them; even so the Son [as God] quickeneth whom he will," and with the Father, distributes

Mark x. 40. Rev. iii. 21. & John vii. 37.

rewards

rewards and punishments to the righteous and the wicked.

Mr. K. supposes "The authority the Father assumes over the Son, and the Son's submission to that authority, plainly points out his inferiority and subordination." After giving his thoughts upon a few passages of Scripture, which he has quoted, he tells us with great boldness, "Could all these things, said of the Son, be *said of the Father*, the argument thus grounded might be inconclusive, but as this is not the case, the force of it must remain." But here he seems to have fallen into an error, which is but too common in controversy, that of quoting Scripture without considering the peculiar state of the person who speaks, or the person who is spoken of. It is true those things which are said of the Son, could not be said of the Father; but then it should be noticed, that the Father did not take upon him our nature, did not become our surety, and consequently did not satisfy divine justice in our behalf; but these things Christ did, and therefore according to the order of the plan of redemption, it was necessary that he should do and suffer the will of his Father. But is it not rather surprizing, that he should say nothing about the Father chastising the Son, bruising him, &c? I think the passages which speak of those things, would have furnished him with stronger arguments, to prove the Son's inferiority,

inferiority, than any he has referred to; for common sense tells us, that to be under command and chastisement, is a greater degree of subordination, than being under the former and not under the latter.

The Scripture declares it was on our account, not on his own, voluntarily and not by compulsion, that he both performed and suffered the will of his Father. * "For their sakes I sanctify myself," † "Who gave himself for us," § "Suffered for sins the just for the unjust that he might bring us to God." Now unless Mr. K. can prove, that Christ did and suffered the will of his heavenly Father, merely on his own account; he leaves the Trinitarians, in full possession of all those arguments which have been repeatedly urged, in defence of the doctrine of God our Saviour.

The passages page 30, which are briefly explained page 31, according to Unitarian sentiments, prove no more than we have already granted; namely, that Christ in his mediatorial capacity, is inferior to the Father; but according to his sentiments, he always was, and always must be in every respect inferior to him; which in my opinion, is quite contrary to many express declarations of Scripture; as there is not an appellation given to the Father, proving him to be the supreme God, which is not given to

* John xvii. 19. † Titus ii. 14. § 1 Peter iii. 18.

the Son; nor any attribute possessed by the Father, but is possessed by the * Son. " For † in him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily."

Can any thing be more expressive of his Eternal Power and Godhead than the following passages? † Emmanuel, **GOD WITH US—** § The **MIGHTY GOD—** || The word was **GOD—** ** And Thomas said, **MY LORD AND MY GOD—** †† Jesus Christ he is **LORD OF ALL—** §§ Feed the church of **GOD** which he hath purchased with his **OWN blood—** ||| **GOD** was manifest in the **FLESH—** *† Adorn the doctrine of **GOD OUR SAVIOUR—** †§ Hereby perceive we the love of **GOD** because he hath laid down **HIS** life for us— ||* He that judgeth me (saith St. Paul) is the **LORD**.

I am persuaded Mr. K. will not deny, that these passages have an immediate reference to our Lord Jesus Christ, the **SAVIOUR** of the **WORLD**. There are also other passages which call for our attention, where the same things are spoken of the Father, and the Son conjointly.

The gospel is sometimes called "The †§ gospel of God," and sometimes "The I gospel

* See Bishop Beveridge's private thoughts upon religion.

† Col. ii. 9. † Matt. i. 23. § Isaiah ix. 6.

|| John i. 1. ** John xx. 28. †† Acts x. 96.

§§ Acts xx. 28. ||| 1 Tim. iii. 16. *† Tit. ii. 10.

†§ 1 John iii. 16. ||* 1 Cor. iv. 4. †§ 1 Thes. ii. 1.

I Rom. i. 16.

of CHRIST." The kingdom of heaven is called, the kingdom of CHRIST and of GOD. The Apostle's prayer for the Thessalonians, was, " Now * our LORD JESUS CHRIST himself, and GOD even our Father, which hath loved us, and given us everlasting consolation, and good hope through grace, comfort your hearts, and stablish you in every good word and work."—When the same inspired writer, delivered his charge to Timothy, he gave it him in the sight of † GOD and before JESUS CHRIST.—The redeemed of the Lord who are in glory are called the ‡ first fruits unto GOD and the LAMB.—Lastly, The LORD GOD ALMIGHTY, and the LAMB are said to be the temple and light of the holy city; and the throne is called § the throne of GOD and of the LAMB: which is in my opinion, the most demonstrative proof of equality, that we can receive.

Mr. K. informs us, that " Numbers of passages strikingly conveying the same sentiments are left unnoticed." And I must tell him, unless he can explain them in a manner more consistent with truth, than those he has already produced, he had much better leave them unnoticed for ever.

* 2 Thes. ii. 16. † 2 Tim. iv. 1. ‡ Rev. xiv. 4.

§ Chap. xxi. 22. xxii. 5.

I can assure him, that the erroneous sentiments which he has undertaken to defend, have been more ably vindicated by those, who have written before him ; so that he has but little cause to value himself, upon the idea of " Placing the Christian religion in a beautiful point of view ;" or of having contributed any thing material, towards the overthrow of the Trinitarian system. Nevertheless, I am willing to hope that he published his book from a good motive, being conscious, that the doctrine he has undertaken to defend, is a doctrine according to Godliness ; and therefore, no one can justly blame him for writing in defence of it. But when he tells us, that in " Adopting Trinitarian sentiments, there is hardly a page of the gospel but seems fraught with absurdity," he appears to have divested himself of that candour, which he tells us, he is desirous of exercising towards those from whom he most widely differs. What a reflection is his assertion, upon those wise and holy men, who have been burning and shining lights in the world, and pillars in the church of Christ : who have adopted Trinitarian sentiments, from reading that gospel, every page of which he tells us, seems fraught with absurdity, according to those sentiments ; who have explained and enforced those doctrines, which he opposes, with great success to the pulling down the strong holds of Satan, and promoting the interest of Christ in the world ; and who have

at last sealed the truth with their blood : * evidencing that they counted not their lives dear unto themselves, so that they might finish their course with joy, and the ministry they had received, of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Before I lay my pen aside, I beg leave to observe, that I have not been writing against the people at large, with whom Mr. K. is connected ; as I am persuaded, there are several of that respectable community, a few of whom are ministers, who have not imbibed the sentiments, he has taken upon him to defend. There are a few names who have not defiled their garments, who have not yet wandered out of the good old way. I would say unto them, in the language of that Apostle, who calls our Saviour "The † LORD OF GLORY," "Do not err my beloved brethren."

The Presbyterian community, which in the last century was orthodox, is much degenerated, and seems at this day almost deluged with Arianism and Socinianism. And it is much to be regretted, that the poisonous weeds are growing up in other dissenting churches ; particularly among the General Baptists.

How would it have grieved that eminent servant of Christ, *Matthew Henry*, to have fore-

* It is well known that most of the Christian Martyrs were Trinitarians.

† James ii. 1.

§ Chap. i. 16.

seen, that a professed Socinian, would at some future day, be appointed to preach to, and watch over, the successors of that congregation, which was favoured with the latter part of his labours. And how would the pious and laborious Dr. *Watts*, have lamented, had he lived to have seen the change that has taken place. To have heard the essential truths of Christianity cried down, in those very pulpits where he has labored to inculcate them—To have beheld the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ laid aside; and human reason substituted in its place. In fine, how would he have been grieved, to have heard man, in his natural state, whom he has repeatedly declared, incapable of thinking a good thought, without the assistance of divine grace, dignified, as a creature worthy of the love and favor of the Supreme Being; capable, by the dint of reason, to make himself wise unto salvation: by repentance to reconcile himself to God, without the atonement of Christ; and every way capable of discharging his duty, without the Lord working in him to will and to do, of his good pleasure.

This however is not yet the case with the General Baptists; those among them who deny that Christ is equal with God the Father, still profess to acknowledge his divinity; and renounce the names of Arian and Socinian: but they do not scruple to call themselves Unitarians,

an appellation which both Arians and Socinians have adopted ; so that however they may differ in other points, they are all agreed in this, that Jesus Christ, in his highest capacity, always was, is, and must forever be inferior to the Father.

Some of them hear this doctrine with regret, and are ready to cry out ; How are the mighty fallen, while others are almost persuaded to believe it, and of whom it may be said, they are already turning aside from the way of truth. Ye faithful ministers ! who are desirous of discharging your duty, to “ The * flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers :” ye who wish to be faithful, in feeding “ the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood :” stir up the gift of God, which is within you, and endeavour to stem the torrent of error : “ Cry† aloud, spare not ;” do not shun to declare unto the people “ the § whole counsel of God :” then shall the name of our Lord Jesus Christ be glorified, and you shall, at the last, be able to say, “ I || have fought the good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith :” and your blessed master, the righteous Judge, shall say unto you “ Well ** done good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord.”

* Acts xx. 28. † Isaiah lviii. 1. § Acts xx. 27.

|| 2 Tim. iv. 7.

** Matt. xxv. 21.

And

And you my fellow christians, of all denominations, who still believe that JESUS CHRIST is *one* with the FATHER ; that he is an object of SUPREME worship : that he is * the LORD over ALL who " is rich unto all who call upon HIM ;" and that it is his spirit which the faithful receive : ye who have the experimental knowledge of Christ, having loved you, and laid down his life for you ; who have felt the efficacy of his blood, the power of his resurrection, and the abiding witness of his spirit : " As † ye have received CHRIST JESUS THE LORD, so walk ye in him : " § Earnestly contend for that faith, which was once delivered to the saints, so shall you " grow || in grace, and in the knowledge of our LORD and SAVIOUR Jesus Christ : To him be glory both now and for ever. AMEN."

7 AP 66

* Rom. x. 12.

† Col. iii. 6.

§ Jude ver. 3.

|| 2 Peter iii. 18.

F I N I S.

ni-
ST
of
RD
on
ful
w-
did
he
ir-
t:
IE
n-
to
nd
R
nd
ch
Co
Co
ed
I
one
and
and
ol